

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/717,076	11/18/2003	Brian S. Appel	10281-011-999	6999	
24341 7	590 06/28/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP. 2 PALO ALTO SQUARE 3000 EL CAMINO REAL			NGUYEN	NGUYEN, TAM M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	PALO ALTO, CA 94306			1764	
			DATE MAILED: 06/28/2006	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4/

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/717,076	APPEL ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Tam M. Nguyen	1764			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONED	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/10/	<u>06</u> .				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-21, 26, 34, 40-42, 48 and 75-83 is/are 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-21, 26, 34, 40-42, 48 and 75-83 is/a 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration. re rejected.				
Application Papers	•				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da				

Art Unit: 1764

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-21,26,34,40-42,48 and 75-83 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-46 of copending Application No. 10/957,540. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims draw to a process for processing of waste to produce useful materials comprising preparing a slurry and reacting the slurry to produce a reacted feed. The present claimed set does not claim the addition of one or more reagents that suppress hydrolysis of carbohydrates. However, the present claimed set does not include the addition of such reagents.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Application/Control Number: 10/717,076 Page 3

Art Unit: 1764

Claims 1-21,26,34,40-42,48 and 75-83 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-75 of copending Application No. 10/954,691. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims draw to a process for processing of waste to produce useful materials comprising preparing a slurry and reacting the slurry to produce a reacted feed. The present claimed set does not claim the second reaction zone. However, the present claimed set does not include the use of a second reaction zone.

Response to Arguments

The argument that the provisional double patenting rejection should be withdrawn since the foregoing rule is applicable here as the provisional double patenting rejection is the only rejection remaining is not persuasive. Since the later-filed application has not been exam, it cannot be determined whether or not the later-filed application is rejected on *other grounds*. Also, since there are three application containing claims that conflict such that an obvious double patenting (ODP) rejection is made in each application base upon the other two, it is not sufficient to file a terminal disclaimer in only one of the applications addressing the other two applications. Therefore, the double patenting rejection is maintained.

The ODP rejection over claims 1-46 of copending Application No. 10/857,540 has been changed to <u>10/957,540</u> due to typos.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tam M. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1452. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/717,076 Page 5

Art Unit: 1764

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tam M. Nguyen Examiner Art Unit 1764

TN